

Date: Mon, 22 Feb 93 04:30:19 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #46
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 22 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 46

Today's Topics:

 Code for Advnacement (was Re: Exam of No Code Tech)
 Eliminate the Written Exam (4 msgs)
 Exam of No Code Tech

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Feb 1993 15:53:27 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swrinde!dptspd!tamsun.tamu.edu!
willis@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Code for Advnacement (was Re: Exam of No Code Tech)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600046@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom)
writes:

*In rec.radio.amateur.policy, willis@cs.tamu.edu (Willis Marti) writes:
[stuff about people missing he sarcasm deleted]

*>And this last part is false. The written tests serve to validate your
*>knowledge of operating practices, regulations and equipment that you
*>*must* use. CW tests validate your knowledge of a mode you *may* use.
*
*I can't think of a single operating practice or equipment that you
**must* use.

How about minimum power to achieve communication?

* And that's true for nearly all the regulations as well.
*Why should I have to know the frequencies of the UHF bands if all I
*plan to do is operate 2 meters? Why should I have to learn about
*ID requirements for RTTY/digital transmissions if I will never use
*those modes?

The major reason(s) to learn them is so you'll not interfere with them as
you do your "thing"(and so that if you do need the knowledge...)

*The answer is that amateurs are supposed to have at least some basic
*knowledge about all facets of the hobby. All hams should know at least
*a little about ATV, packet, VHF propagation and, yes, even CW. One
*reason is that you MIGHT use one of those modes someday, so you need
*to know how to do it right. Another reason is that if you do know
*something about it, you are MORE LIKELY to try it sometime in
*the future. Diversity is good -- it should be encouraged.

Agreed! But you're still missing the point. Amateurs are not required
to show proficiency in actually using any mode *except Morse*. That
requirement (at some speed) is probably valid for HF privileges. But
you've *still* given no reason why demonstration of Morse proficiency
(at any speed) should be required for advancement (specifically for
space privileges or being a VE).

Cheers,

Willis n5szf

Date: Sun, 21 Feb 1993 15:32:41 GMT
From: usc!wupost!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600047@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom)
writes:

>

>The kids definitely have more of a problem with the written exam than the
>code. A good example is a father/son team I know. The father is an
>electrical engineer -- he passed the Tech written easily, and I'm sure
>could pass the other written exams with no problem, but he failed the
>code. The son passed the code test easily, but failed the Tech written.
>Now the son is a Novice and the father a no-code Tech. They can't
>talk to each other on the air!

They can if they buy 222 MHz or 1.2 GHz radios.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 19 Feb 93 09:50:03 EST
From: psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@nyu.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu (Antonio Querubin) writes:

>In article <1142@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

>>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, perry@hpfco.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:

>>>Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.

>>

>>A few?

>

>How can it be 'nice' if it was lost on a lot of people? If you read this
>newsgroup, you might do so because you're interested in the opinions of other
>folks who may be at least as intelligent as you are. If one assumes that, and
>the sarcasm was lost on all these intelligent folks, then the sarcasm wasn't
>effectively delivered was it?

So, you're arguing that all readers and posters to this group are
equally intelligent? What an odd coincidence!

> So how can it be 'nice'? On the other hand, you
>may believe this newsgroups readers are dumber than you are. In that case,
>wouldn't you think that the posting would be lost on the reader audience
>anyway, so why post it as sarcasm in the first place? For that matter, why
>would you continue to be a participant/reader of the newsgroup?

What *I* believe is that the readership of the newsgroup consists of
a broad range of people, most of whom can read and interpret well-
written prose, but some of whom, clearly, can not. (BTW, before it gets
lost in the attributions, I'm not the poster of the original article.)

>What's the point? As with most poorly done sarcastic Usenet postings, the
>folks who usually catch the sarcasm are those who are familiar with previous
>posts of the sender or know him/her.

The posting in question requires no such prior knowledge and therefore
does not qualify as a poorly done sarcastic posting by your definition.
What it *does* require is the ability to read all the way to the end
of the posting, giving it thoughtful consideration rather than turning

on the flamethrower before you've even read through the thing.

Don't you wonder why we always end up discussing the appropriateness of postings rather than the issues they address?

Gee, I guess the bottom line is that it's OK to use profanity here but it's not OK to use sarcasm. What a strange place is Usenet!

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: Mon, 22 Feb 1993 03:03:11 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!tony@ames.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1147@arrl.org> jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

>So, you're arguing that all readers and posters to this group are
>equally intelligent? What an odd coincidence!

No. Better read through that again thoughtfully.

>What *I* believe is that the readership of the newsgroup consists of
>a broad range of people, most of whom can read and interpret well-
>written prose, but some of whom, clearly, can not. (BTW, before it gets
>lost in the attributions, I'm not the poster of the original article.)

So you do accept that some of the readership will detect sarcasm and some will not? So take those two groups and ask yourself whether the original note had the intended 'sarcastic' effect the author intended.

>What it *does* require is the ability to read all the way to the end
>of the posting, giving it thoughtful consideration rather than turning
>on the flamethrower before you've even read through the thing.

I did. And I think so did others. They saw a message, didn't detect any sarcasm in it, took it at face value and replied to it. They were then promptly mocked, not for the merit of their responses, but because they had not caught the 'sarcasm'.

>Don't you wonder why we always end up discussing the appropriateness
>of postings rather than the issues they address?

Don't you wonder why there is an endless stream of bait and flame in this and similar newsgroups? Knowing that to be the case, I only look through this newsgroup once in a while. Unfortunately, I and many others took the bait and missed the 'sarcasm'.

>Gee, I guess the bottom line is that it's OK to use profanity here but
>it's not OK to use sarcasm. What a strange place is Usenet!

The bottom line is that one communicate ideas/thoughts to others. In this instance, I would assert that 'sarcasm' was lost on the audience and was therefore ineffective. You said earlier that you expect readers to read through a message giving it thoughtful consideration. It wouldn't be unfair to expect message writers to do the same before posting. Otherwise we have a fundamental failure in communication.

--

Antonio Querubin
tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu / ah6bw@uhm.ampr.org / querubin@uhunix.bitnet

Date: 22 Feb 1993 04:16:58 GMT
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C2txtB.B0v@news.Hawaii.Edu> tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu (Antonio Querubin) writes:

>

>Don't you wonder why there is an endless stream of bait and flame in this
>and similar newsgroups? Knowing that to be the case, I only look through this
>newsgroup once in a while.

I was chagrined to see the first case of this pop up in the Lego newsgroup. I mean, Legos? What can be more flame-resistant a topic than Legos. I have blotted the memory out but I believe it had to do with those who build the kits in the instructions vs. those who set out to create their own. Personally I like it better when we talk about antennas, grounding, and how to learn CW without your wife killing you. My killfile is growing incredibly long, and it takes forever to go through it.

Have a nice day!
-Greg.

Date: 20 Feb 93 06:23:20 EST
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!ncrhub2!ncrgw2!psinntp!

arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Exam of No Code Tech
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Those worried about RF safety and interference might consider serious QRP work--seeing what you can work with a milliwatt level transmitters.

I seriously doubt whether the FCC could impose quiet hours on a clean station that overloaded a neighbor's TV set running 1 mW. Seeing as they allow unlicensed cordless phones and other widgets running a bit more power.

I've worked both troposcatter and rain scatter on 10 GHz with stations running 1.2 and .4 mW, respectively.

Granted, the record setting 24 and 47 GHz is being done with a little more power (10 mW), but my guess is that the initial records on the bands between 100 and 300 GHz will be done with a mW or less.

But, milliwatting need not be restricted to microwaves. What better way to hide your control links by routinely using extremely low power, so that your signal is essentially lost in the noise, unless you know exactly where to look?

Finally, many of the HF contesters are so skilled that they can easily be worked with a milliwatt--even DXCC seems within the realm of possibility running a mW to a good antenna system. Some of them even appreciate the QSL cards attesting to their skills, and return the favor with a speedy confirmation of the contact :-).

Yes, not everything can be done with a milliwatt of RF, but it can be fun finding out what is possible....

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

Internet: zlau@arrl.org	"Working" on 24 GHz SSB/CW gear
	Operating Interests: 10 GHz CW/SSB/FM
US Mail: c/o ARRL Lab	80/40/20 CW
225 Main Street	Station capability: QRP, 1.8 MHz to 10 GHz
Newington CT 06111	modes: CW/SSB/FM/packet
	amtor/ baudot
Phone (if you really have to): 203-666-1541	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #46
